REMARKS

Claims 3-5, 8-9, 12, 14-16, 18, and 20-24 are currently pending in this application, as amended. Claim 2 has been canceled. Claims 3-5 have been amended to depend from independent claim 21. Claim 8 has been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicants regard as their invention. Support for the amendment to claim 8 can be found, for example, in the original Specification at page 6, lines 20-31, original claim 12, and in Fig. 1. Claims 12 and 21 have also been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicants regard as their invention. Support for the amendments to claims 12 and 21 can be found, for example, in the original Specification at page 7, lines 19-23. Claims 22-24 have been added. Support for the added claims can be found, for example, in the original Specification at page 1, lines 18-23 and at page 6, lines 20-31. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

Request for Telephone Interview Prior to Formal Action on Amendment

Applicants respectfully request a telephone interview with the Examiner prior to formal action on this response. An "Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form" accompanies this response. Please contact Applicants' undersigned representative to schedule the interview.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C.§ 102(e)

Rejection of Claims 8-9 and 20

Claims 8-9 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0064805 ("Wells"). Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 8-9 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn in view of the foregoing amendments and for at least the following reasons.

Claim 8, as amended, recites *inter alia*:

> a second amusement device having a video touchscreen, a controller and a memory, the memory of the second amusement device storing a plurality of video games playable on the second amusement device using at least the video touchscreen of the second amusement device, the second amusement device being coupled to the first amusement device by the communication link,

> the first amusement device communicating with the second amusement device using the communication medium.
>
> [Emphasis added]

Wells fails to teach, suggest, or disclose that the second amusement device stores a plurality of video games playable on the second amusement device.

Referring to Figs. 1-3, Wells discloses a gaming machine 100 in communication with a wireless game player 125 for presenting games of chance. The wireless game player 125 is used as a remote extension of gaming machine 100 to extend game playing capabilities. See paragraph [0034]. The gaming machine 100 stores the game logic (as required by gaming regulations), which is executed by a master gaming controller 224, for presentation on either the gaming machine 100 or the wireless game player 125. See paragraph [0036]. When a game is played on the wireless game player 125, all events, outcomes, information, and transactions take place in the gaming machine 100 and not the wireless game device 125. "Thus, the wireless game player 125 may be considered a remote extension of the gaming machine's 100 display and input mechanisms." (Emphasis added). See paragraph [0038]. Even when the necessary graphics are rendered by the wireless game player 125, "all of the game logic necessary still resides on the gaming machine." See paragraph [0085].

In contrast, claim 8 of the present invention, as amended, is directed to wireless communication among like amusement devices. The second amusement device includes many of the features of the first amusement device, *i.e.*, a touchscreen, controller, memory, and a plurality of games stored in memory. Accordingly, each amusement device may be operated completely independently of the other. For example, the second amusement device does not require any functionality of the first amusement device in order to present a game to a user.

The wireless game player 125 of Wells clearly does not include all of the features of the gaming machine 100, nor is the wireless game player 125 independently operable from the gaming machine 100. Wells repeatedly emphasizes that the wireless game player 125 does not store the game logic required for playing games of chance because of gaming regulations. See paragraphs [0010], [0012], [0036], [0038], [0085]. The wireless game player 125 is always

operated in conjunction with the gaming machine 100 to provide the game of chance. See, for example, Figs. 5 and 6.

Wells also does not describe wireless communication among gaming machines 100. For example, Fig. 4 shows several sets of gaming machines 465-469 and 475-479 as part of a wireless network on a casino floor. However, each of the gaming machines 465-469, 475-479 is coupled via Ethernet to a common wireless access point 425. See paragraph [0093]. No wireless signals are therefore transmitted from one gaming machine 100 to another. None of the embodiments described in Wells teaches facilitating wireless communication among gaming machines 100. Wells teaches only wireless communication between gaming machines 100 and wireless game players 125. Wells describes no more than a remote extension of a gaming machine 100, wherein all of the games are stored on the gaming machine 100. The remote extension 125 is virtually inoperable but for communication with the gaming machine 100 (*i.e.*, like a dumb terminal). Wells therefore does not teach, suggest, or disclose a first amusement device having a plurality of games stored in memory communicating wirelessly with a second amusement device having a plurality of games stored in memory.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent claim 8 and dependent claims 9 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 3-5, 12, 14-16, 18, and 21

Claims 3-5, 12, 14-16, 18, and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wells. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 3-5, 12, 14-16, 18, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn in view of the foregoing amendments and for at least the following reasons.

Claim 12, as amended, recites *inter alia*:

> the video touchscreen of the first and third amusement devices each allowing a user to access the controller of the second amusement device to cause the controller of the second amusement device to retrieve one of the music files from the memory of the second amusement device and output the retrieved music file to the audio output of the second amusement device.

[Emphasis added]

Claim 21, as amended, recites *inter alia*:

> the video touchscreen of the first amusement device allowing a user to access the controller of the second amusement device to cause the controller of the second amusement device to retrieve one of the music files from the memory of the second amusement device and output the retrieved music file to the audio output of the second amusement device.
>
> [Emphasis added]

Wells fails to teach, suggest, or disclose that a touchscreen of the first amusement device allows a user to access the controller of the second amusement device in order to retrieve music files stored in the memory of the second amusement device.

As described above with respect to claim 8, Wells discloses a wireless game player 125 that functions as a remote extension of a casino gaming machine 100. Referring to Fig. 2, entertainment content is also available to a user for viewing on a gaming machine 2 or wireless game player 125. For example, a video jukebox consisting of a DVD player and DVDs may be one entertainment source. The DVDs may be stored on the gaming machine 2 or at a central location. The videos may be viewed on display screens 34 or 42 of gaming machine 2 or on display 126 of wireless gaming device 125. See paragraphs [0072]-[0073]. A variety of entertainment content is available, all of which is sent to the wireless game player 125. See paragraph [0023].

In contrast, claims 12 and 21 of the present invention, as amended, are directed to allowing a user of a first amusement device to wirelessly access the controller of a second amusement device for causing the controller of the second amusement device to retrieve one of the music files stored in the memory of the second amusement device. For example, the user of an arcade game may access a remote jukebox wirelessly to cause the jukebox to play a song stored on the jukebox.

As described above, the wireless game player 125 of Wells does not store a plurality of music files that may be selectively retrieved. The wireless game player 125 receives the

entertainment content from elsewhere, such as the gaming machine 100 or a central server. Similarly, Wells includes no description that the user of the gaming machine 100 is allowed access to the microprocessor 254 of the wireless game player 125. At most, a user of the gaming machine 100 may direct that content chosen with the controller 224 of the gaming machine 100 may be directed to play on the wireless game player 125. However, the user is not being permitted to access the microprocessor 254 of the wireless game player 125 to perform tasks using the microprocessor 254. The user is operating the controller 224 of the gaming machine 100 only. Wells therefore does not teach, suggest, or disclose allowing a user of a first amusement device to wirelessly access the controller of a second amusement device for causing the controller of the second amusement device to retrieve one of the music files stored in the memory of the second amusement device.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent claims 12 and 21 and dependent claims 3-5, 14-16, and 18 be under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

New Claims

Claims 22-24 have been added. Support for the claims can be found, for example, in the original Specification at page 1, lines 18-23 and at page 6, lines 20-31.

Claim 22 is directed to a method of operating an amusement system, and recites, *inter alia*:

> allowing, by the communication link, a user of the first amusement device to play one of the plurality of video games against a user of the second amusement device
>
> [Emphasis added]

Wells fails to teach, suggest, or disclose that a user of the first amusement device may play a game against a user of the second amusement device.

As described above, Wells discloses a gaming machine 100 in communication with a wireless game player 125 for presenting games of chance. The gaming machine 100 may simultaneously provide game play remotely and locally, e.g., one game player may use the gaming machine 100 for local play while another game player uses the wireless game player 125

connected to the gaming machine 100 to play remotely. See paragraph [0058]. The wireless device 125 is being used as a remote extension of gaming machine's 100 display and inputs. See paragraph [0038].

In contrast, claim 22 is directed to enabling wireless head-to-head competition among users of different amusement devices. Many games, for example, chess or puzzle games, are configured to be played among multiple competitors at separate amusement devices. The multiple competitors are thus simultaneously playing the same game.

The wireless game player 125 and gaming machine 100 of Wells allow two users to utilize the services of gaming machine 100 simultaneously, but the users are not playing against one another. Each user is separately playing his or her own game, and the gaming machine 100 is therefore acting more as a game server enabling simultaneous access rather than a device promoting head-to-head real-time competition. In fact, Wells nowhere indicates that any of the available games of gaming machine 100 offer anything but single-player mode. Therefore, Wells fails to teach, suggest, or disclose an amusement system enabling multi-player competition among amusement devices.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 22 is patentable over the prior art of record, for the reasons discussed above. Claims 23-24 are dependent from claim 22, and Applicants submit that claims 23-24 are patentable over the prior art of record, for at least their dependence on claim 22.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing Amendment and Remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application, including claims 3-5, 8-9, 12, 14-16, 18, and 20-24, as amended, is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

James R. Stelzer, *et al.*

October 11, 2007 By: _____
(Date)

JOHN D. SIMMONS
Registration No. 52,225
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP
One Commerce Square
2005 Market Street, Suite 2200
Philadelphia, PA 19103-7013
Telephone: 215-965-1200
Direct Dial: 215-965-1268
Facsimile: 215-965-1210
E-Mail: jsimmons@akingump.com

JDS/SEM
7866724